VEGETATION CLASSIFICATION AND SURVEY

International Association for Vegetation Science (IAVS)

Vegetation Classification and Survey 2: 305–309
doi: 10.3897/VCS/2021/78172

REPORT PHYTOSOCIOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Report 2 of the Committee for Change and Conservation of Names (CCCN)

Wolfgang Willner[1], Andraž Čarni[2,3], Federico Fernández-González[4], Jens Pallas[5], Jean-Paul Theurillat[6,7]

1 *Department of Botany and Biodiversity Research, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria*
2 *Research Center of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Ljubljana, Slovenia*
3 *University of Nova Gorica, Nova Gorica, Slovenia*
4 *Institute of Environmental Sciences, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Toledo, Spain*
5 *Münster, Germany*
6 *Fondation J.-M. Aubert, Champex-Lac, Switzerland*
7 *Department of Botany and Plant Biology, Section of Biology, University of Geneva, Chambésy, Switzerland*

Corresponding author: Wolfgang Willner (wolfgang.willner@univie.ac.at)

Academic editor: Florian Jansen ♦ **Received** 18 November 2021 ♦ **Accepted** 30 November 2021 ♦ **Published** 30 December 2021

Abstract

In this Report, three previously published nomenclatural proposals are discussed, and recommendations on acceptance or rejection of these proposals are provided. The proposals concern the following syntaxa: *Berberidion* Braun-Blanquet 1950, *Aceretalia pseudoplatani* Moor 1976 and *Festucetalia valesiacae* Braun-Blanquet et Tüxen ex Braun-Blanquet 1950.

Abbreviations: CCCN = Committee for the Change and Conservation of Names; GPN = Working Group for Phytosociological Nomenclature; ICPN = International Code of Phytosociological Nomenclature.

Keywords

nomenclature, nomen conservandum, phytosociology, syntaxonomy

Introduction

The Committee for the Change and Conservation of Names (CCCN) is the successor of the Committee for Nomina Conservanda, Ambigua, Inversa and Mutata (CNC) established by the 3rd edition of the International Code of Phytosociological Nomenclature (ICPN) (Weber et al. 2000; Willner et al. 2015). A first Report was published in 2011, containing recommendations on 19 proposals submitted to the Committee (Willner et al. 2011). In 2015, the Assembly of the Working Group for Phytosociological Nomenclature (GPN) voted on three of these proposals (Gigante et al. 2019), and the accepted ones were published in appendix 3 and 4 of the ICPN, 4th edition (Theurillat et al. 2021). One proposal – which has not been submitted to vote yet – is re-evaluated here with some modifications (see proposal 17* below). The other proposals discussed in Willner et al. (2011), all of them referring to *nomina mutata*, are obsolete since the adaptation of syntaxon names to changes in the names of the name-giving taxa does no longer require submission of a proposal (see Art. 44 and Art. 45 in the 4th edition of the ICPN).

Following the publication of the new edition of the ICPN, the CCCN resumed its activity. Federico Fernández-González was elected as a member to replace Heinrich Weber who passed away in 2020. Therefore, the current members are: Wolfgang Willner (chair), Andraž Čarni, Federico Fernández-González, Jens Pallas and Jean-Paul Theurillat.

Some nomenclatural cases turned out to be quite complicated, so the progress in the Committee was slower than

PENSOFT

Copyright *Author*. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

expected. In the following, we discuss three proposals and present our recommendations. Some published proposals (Theurillat et al. 2017; Novák 2019; Fernández-González et al. 2021) are still pending and will be treated in the next Report, which is scheduled for 2022. The Committee will also discuss the submitted requests for a binding decision (Silva and Molina 2021), a procedure newly introduced in the 4th edition of the ICPN.

Authors who wish to submit a proposal are asked to consult appendix 2 of the ICPN and the recently published proposals in *Vegetation Classification and Survey* (Fernández-González et al. 2021). Authors who wish to request a binding decision should consult appendix 6 and the request by Silva and Molina (2021).

Recommendations on published proposals

Note: An asterisk (*) after the number of the proposal indicates that the recommended version of the proposal differs from the original one.

(17*) To conserve the name *Berberidion* Braun-Blanquet 1950 with a conserved type and against *Prunion spinosae* Soó 1931. Modified version of the proposal published in Willner et al. (2011). Votes: 4 pro, 1 contra (recommended).

(17*) *Berberidion* Braun-Blanquet 1950 [Braun-Blanquet 1948–1950, part 6: 349].
Typus cons. propos.: *Berberido-Rosetum* Braun-Blanquet 1961: 189.

(=) *Prunion spinosae* Soó 1931: 294.
Typus: *Crataego monogynae-Prunetum spinosae* Soó 1931: 312 (holotypus).

The original diagnosis of the alliance *Berberidion* Braun-Blanquet 1950 includes two associations: "*Rosetum rhamnosum* Braun-Blanquet 1918" and "*Coryleto-Populetum* Braun-Blanquet (1919) 1938". Most authors, including Willner et al. (2011), have regarded the "*Rosetum rhamnosum*" as invalidly published, considering the "*Coryleto-Populetum*" (recte: *Corylo-Populetum*) as the holotype of the alliance. A closer look to the original diagnosis of the *Berberidion* Braun-Blanquet 1950 revealed that the previous evaluations were partly wrong. First, the name *Rosetum rhamnosum* is not invalid according to Art. 3e since the epithet "*rhamnosum*" does not have the termination *-etosum* indicating a subassociation. Instead, it should be interpreted as an epithet in the nominative case that indicates a morphological or other property (Art. 34a). In Braun-Blanquet (1918), the *Rosetum rhamnosum* was proposed as a subassociation of the "*Corylus*-Assoziation", so the name was indeed invalidly published in 1918 (Art. 3e). In Braun-Blanquet (1948–1950), the association *Rosetum rhamnosum* could be interpreted as validly published because there is a reference to Braun-Blanquet (1918: 19) where the *Rosetum rhamnosum* is synonymised with the "Muschnaformation von Hager" ("Muschna" is a Romansh name for a clearance cairn) and accompanied with a reference to Hager (1916). Indeed, Hager (l.c.: 211–212) published a species list with three semi-quantitative categories of frequency which can be considered as sufficient original diagnosis (Art. 7). However, Braun-Blanquet (1918) specifically referred to p. 212 of Hager, where there is a species list of one particular example of a "Muschnaformation" without quantitative indications. The chapter where both species lists are provided is titled "Die Assoziationen der Muschna-Hügel" (the associations of the Muschna hills) which in turn is part of the chapter on the "Formation von *Prunus padus*" (Formation of *Prunus padus*). While it is clear that Hager (1916) considered both species lists as belonging to the same abstract vegetation unit (the Formation of *Prunus padus* growing on Muschna hills), it is not clear whether Braun-Blanquet intended to refer specifically to the species list on p. 212 or to the whole formation described by Hager. To make things even more complicated, Braun-Blanquet (1948–1950) did not directly cite the "Muschnaformation" but a different page (p. 220) in Hager (1916) where another community with *Berberis* is described ("alluviale *Berberis*-Strauchheide"), which lacks a sufficient original diagnosis. Given this problematic situation, opinions about the validity of the name *Rosetum rhamnosum* Braun-Blanquet 1950 were not unanimous among the members of the CCCN.

The second association in the original diagnosis of the alliance *Berberidion*, the *Corylo-Populetum* Braun-Blanquet 1950, was also not correctly evaluated in previous nomenclatural analyses. The only element in the original diagnosis of the *Corylo-Populetum* arguably meeting the prescriptions of Art. 7 is the reference to Brockmann-Jerosch (1907) who published a single relevé of the "Haselstrauch-Formation" on page 265, although this relevé only contains the woody species, among which are both *Corylus avellana* and *Berberis vulgaris*. [The same reference to Brockmann-Jerosch (1907) was indicated by Braun-Blanquet (1918: 18–19, 80) for his "Assoziation von *Corylus avellana*". Hence the *Corylo-Populetum* Braun-Blanquet 1950 is a nomenclatural synonym of the *Coryletum avellanae* Braun-Blanquet 1918.] The other references given by Braun-Blanquet (1948–1950) contain only species lists or *nomina nuda*, including the species list of the *Coryletum* in Beger (1922) in which abundance values are indicated for less than half of the species.

Since the *Corylo-Populetum* has often been excluded from the *Berberidion* and classified within a separate alliance *Corylo-Populion* (see, e.g., Braun-Blanquet 1961), it is not a suitable type for the name *Berberidion*. Even if the *Rosetum rhamnosum* might be considered as validly published, choosing a neotype for this illegitimate name and then selecting this association as lectotype for the *Berberidion* does not appear the best solution to serve the goal of nomenclatural stability. Willner et al. (2011) recommended conserving the next valid publication of the name *Berberidion*, which appeared in Tüxen (1952), with the *Pruno-Ligustretum* Tüx-

en 1952 as lectotype. However, the 4th edition of the ICPN (Theurillat et al. 2021) offers a more elegant solution, namely a conserved type (Art. 53). The best choice for a conserved type of the *Berberidion* Braun-Blanquet 1950 is obviously the *Berberido-Rosetum* Braun-Blanquet 1961, which is the correct name for the "*Rosetum rhamnosum*".

Therefore, we recommend to conserve the name *Berberidion* Braun-Blanquet 1950 with a conserved type, as outlined above. As the original diagnosis of the *Berberido-Rosetum* Braun-Blanquet 1961 contains no direct reference to the *Rosetum rhamnosum*, it must be considered as a new association. Willner and Grabherr (2007: 224) selected the following lectotype for the *Berberido-Rosetum*: Braun-Blanquet (1961), table 40, relevé 6.

Another point that emerged during the discussion of this proposal is the name *Prunion spinosae* Soó 1931. Sádlo et al. (2013: 87, 92–93) considered it as a synonym of the *Berberidion* and proposed its rejection as *nomen ambiguum*. Indeed, the name *Prunion spinosae* has mostly been used in a sense that excludes its type, often with a wrong year (Wirth 1993; Borhidi et al. 2012). We refrain here from commenting on this proposal, that has not been officially submitted to the CCCN yet. However, it is clear that the name *Prunion spinosae* Soó 1931 poses a potential threat to the well-established name *Berberidion* Braun-Blanquet 1950, so we recommend to conserve the latter against this older name. Nevertheless, the adoption of this proposal would still allow to use the name *Prunion spinosae* if its type association (*Crataego monogynae-Prunetum spinosae* Soó 1931) is considered as not belonging to the *Berberidion*.

(20) To conserve the name *Aceretalia pseudoplatani* Moor 1976 against *Tilietalia* Moor 1973. Proposed by Willner (2015). Votes: 4 pro, 0 contra, 1 abstention (recommended).

This proposal (Willner 2015) means to conserve the name *Aceretalia pseudoplatani* (Moor 1976: 336) against the name *Tilietalia* (Moor 1973: 129) when European maple and lime forests are united within a single order. If the lime forests are treated as a separate order, the name *Tilietalia* Moor 1973 would still be available. The name *Aceretalia pseudoplatani* is widely accepted in the literature (e.g., Mucina et al. 2016), and the CCCN also agrees that *Acer pseudoplatanus* is a better name giving taxon for the united order. Therefore, acceptance of the proposal is recommended.

(21) To conserve the name *Festucetalia valesiacae* Br.-Bl. et Tx. ex Br.-Bl. 1950 against *Festucetalia* Soó 1940. Proposed by Terzi et al. (2017). Votes: 1 pro, 4 contra (not recommended).

The name *Festucetalia valesiacae* is generally accepted for the order of continental grass steppes of western Eurasia. However, there is disagreement on the correct author citation of this name. Mucina et al. (2016) attribute it to Soó (1947), but as showed by Terzi et al. (2017), Soó (1947) simply emended and renamed his earlier, validly published order *Festucetalia* Soó 1940. The original diagnosis of this order is very heterogeneous, including communities that are currently placed in at least three orders belonging to two different classes. Even more problematic, *Festuca valesiaca* is absent from the original diagnosis of the type alliance "*Festucion sulcatae*" Soó 1930 (recte: *Festucion rupicolae* Soó 1930 nom. corr.). The name *Festucetalia valesiacae* was coined by Braun-Blanquet and Tüxen (1943), but not validly published due to the lack of bibliographical references. Indeed, even Soó (1964) accepted Braun-Blanquet's and Tüxen's name, putting his own *Festucetalia* Soó 1940 into the synonymy. Therefore, the majority of the CCCN agreed with the general proposal to conserve the later validation of the name *Festucetalia valesiacae* by Braun-Blanquet (1948–1950) against Soó's *Festucetalia*. However, there is a problem with the type of the order. Braun-Blanquet (1948–1950) did not provide a reference to the alliance *Festucion valesiacae* Klika 1931, which is included in the order in Braun-Blanquet and Tüxen (1943), and from which the order name obviously is derived. The holotype of the *Festucetalia valesiacae* Br.-Bl. et Tx. ex Br.-Bl. 1950 is the alliance *Stipo-Poion xerophilae* Br.-Bl. et Tx. ex Br.-Bl. 1950, as this is the only alliance mentioned by Braun-Blanquet (1948–1950) within the order. It is an illegitimate, heterotypic homonym of the *Stipo-Poion xerophilae* Br.-Bl. et Richard 1950 (Braun-Blanquet and Richard 1950: 127). The type association of the *Stipo-Poion xerophilae* Br.-Bl. et Tx. ex Br.-Bl. 1950 is the *Astragalo onobrychidis-Brometum erecti* Br.-Bl. 1950, which – according to Willner et al. (2019) – belongs to the order *Brachypodietalia pinnati* (semi-dry grasslands of western Eurasia). Therefore, the conservation of the name *Festucetalia valesiacae* Br.-Bl. et Tx. ex Br.-Bl. 1950 only makes sense if it is, at the same time, conserved with a conserved type reflecting the current use of the order name (see proposal 21*).

(21*) To conserve the name *Festucetalia valesiacae* Br.-Bl. et Tx. ex Br.-Bl. 1950 with a conserved type and against *Festucetalia* Soó 1940. Modified version of the proposal by Terzi et al. (2017). Votes: 3 pro, 2 contra (recommended).

(21*) *Festucetalia valesiacae* Braun-Blanquet et Tüxen ex Braun-Blanquet 1950 [Braun-Blanquet 1948–1950, part 3: 312].
Typus cons. propos.: *Festucion valesiacae* Klika 1931: 376.

(=) *Festucetalia* Soó 1940: 32.
Typus: *Festucion rupicolae* Soó 1930 nom. corr. (lectotypus; Terzi et al. 2016).

As discussed above, the strict application of the ICPN leads to the conclusion that the name *Festucetalia valesiacae* Br.-Bl. et Tx. ex Br.-Bl. 1950 is based on an association most likely not belonging to the order as it is currently understood. Therefore, a conserved type has to be chosen. While the authors of the original proposal suggested the

legitimate name *Stipo-Poion xerophilae* Br.-Bl. et Richard 1950, based on the *Festuco valesiacae-Caricetum supinae* Br.-Bl. 1936 (lectotypus selected by Terzi et al. 2016), the majority of the CCCN felt that the *Festucion valesiacae* Klika 1931 would be more suitable as conserved type of the order *Festucetalia valesiacae*. The following arguments are put forward for this decision: (1) Braun-Blanquet and Tüxen (1943) obviously derived the order name *Festucetalia valesiacae* from the *Festucion valesiacae* (in fact, the content of that order is identical with the previous, broader concept of the alliance); (2) everyone would expect the *Festucion valesiacae* being the type of the *Festucetalia valesiacae* by looking at the names (indeed, the *Festucion valesiacae* would be the automatic type of the order according to Art. 20 if there were a proper reference to Klika, either in Braun-Blanquet and Tüxen 1943 or in Braun-Blanquet 1948–1950); (3) the name *Festucetalia valesiacae* is attributed to Soó 1947 in the EuroVegChecklist (Mucina et al. 2016), and Soó (1947) referred to Klika's *Festucion valesiacae* as a corresponding name of his *Festucetalia valesiacae*; (4) the remote possibility that the alliance *Festucion valesiacae* ends up in a different order than the *Festucetalia valesiacae* should be excluded.

The alliance names *Festucion valesiacae* Klika 1931 and *Festucion rupicolae* Soó 1930 nom. corr. are currently considered as syntaxonomic synonyms (Mucina et al. 2016: 85). In the same publication it has been suggested that the name *Festucion rupicolae* Soó 1930 nom. corr. should be rejected as *nomen ambiguum*, but no such proposal has been submitted to the CCCN yet. However, conserving the name *Festucetalia valesiacae* with the *Festucion valesiacae* Klika 1931 as conserved type does not necessarily mean that the name *Festucion valesiacae* must be conserved as well or be accepted as the correct name of an alliance. The *Festucion valesiacae* Klika 1931 was lectotypified by Toman (1975) with the *Ranunculo illyrici-Festucetum valesiacae* Klika 1931, and he also selected a type relevé for the latter association (rel. 45).

Author contributions

All authors are members of the CCCN and participated in the evaluation and discussion of the proposals. W.W. planned the Report and wrote the first draft, which was commented and revised by all authors.

References

Beger HKE (1922) Assoziationsstudien in der Waldstufe des Schanfiggs. Jahresbericht der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft Graubündens 61 (1. Beilage): 1–147.

Borhidi A, Kevey B, Lendvai G (2012) Plant communities of Hungary. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, HU.

Braun-Blanquet J (1918) Eine pflanzengeographische Exkursion durchs Unterengadin und in den schweizerischen Nationalpark. Beiträge zur geobotanischen Landesaufnahme 4: 1–71.

Braun-Blanquet J (1948–1950) Übersicht der Pflanzengesellschaften Rätiens. Vegetatio 1: 29–41, 129–146, 285–316; 2: 20–37, 214–237, 341–360.

Braun-Blanquet J (1961) Die inneralpine Trockenvegetation. Von der Provence bis zur Steiermark. Gustav Fischer, Stuttgart, DE.

Braun-Blanquet J, Richard R (1950) Groupements végétaux et sols du bassin de Sierre. Bulletin de la Murithienne 66: 106–134.

Braun-Blanquet J, Tüxen R (1943) Übersicht der höheren Vegetationseinheiten Mitteleuropas (unter Ausschluss der Hochgebirge). Communication de la Station Internationale de Géobotanique Méditerranéenne et Alpine, Montpellier, 84: 1–11.

Brockmann-Jerosch H (1907) Pflanzengesellschaften der Schweizeralpen, I. Teil. Die Flora des Puschlav (Bezirk Bernina, Kanton Graubünden) und ihre Pflanzengesellschaften. Wilhelm Engelmann, Leipzig, DE. https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.9796

Fernández-González F, Silva V, Theurillat J-P (2021) Proposals (26–27): to conserve the names *Nanocyperetalia* Klika 1935 and *Isoetetalia* Braun-Blanquet 1936. Vegetation Classification and Survey 2: 65–69. https://doi.org/10.3897/VCS/2021/66398

Gigante D, Čarni A, Bültmann H, Fernández-González F, Mucina L, Theurillat J-P, Willner W (2019) Decision on Nomenclatural Proposals (1), (16) and (18). Phytocoenologia 49: 309–310. https://doi.org/10.1127/phyto/2019/0330

Hager PK (1916) Verbreitung der wildwachsenden Holzarten im Vorderrheintal (Kanton Graubünden). Buchdruckerei Büchler & Co, Bern, CH.

Klika J (1931) Studien über die xerotherme Vegetation Mitteleuropas. I. Die Pollauer Berge im südlichen Mähren. Beihefte zum Botanischen Centralblatt, Abt. 2, 47: 343–398.

Moor M (1973) Das *Corydalido-Aceretum*, ein Beitrag zur Systematik der Ahornwälder. Berichte der Schweizerischen Botanischen Gesellschaft 83: 106–132.

Moor M (1976) Gedanken zur Systematik mitteleuropäischer Laubwälder. Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Forstwesen 127: 327–340.

Mucina L, Bültmann H, Dierßen K, Theurillat JP, Raus T, Čarni A, Šumberová K, Willner W, Dengler J, … Tichý L (2016) Vegetation of Europe: hierarchical floristic classification system of vascular plant, bryophyte, lichen, and algal communities. Applied Vegetation Science 19 (suppl. 1): 3–264. https://doi.org/10.1111/avsc.12257

Novák P (2019) Proposals (23–25): to conserve the names *Galio-Carpinetum* Oberdorfer 1957, *Lithospermo-Carpinetum* Oberdorfer 1957, and *Stellario-Carpinetum* Oberdorfer 1957. Phytocoenologia 49: 409–411. https://doi.org/10.1127/phyto/2019/0346

Sádlo J, Chytrý M, Vítková M, Petřík P, Kolbek J, Neuhäuslová Z (2013) Mezofilní a suché křoviny a akátiny (*Rhamno-Prunetea*). Mesic and xeric scrub and *Robinia* groves. In: Chytrý M (Ed.) Vegetace České republiky 4. Lesní a křovinná vegetace. Academia, Praha, CZ, 74–156.

Silva V, Molina JA (2021) Requests (1–2) for a binding decision on the name-giving taxa in the names *Isoeto-Cicendietum* Br.-Bl. 1967 and *Verbeno-Gnaphalietum* Rivas Goday 1970. Vegetation Classification and Survey 2: 71–72. https://doi.org/10.3897/VCS/2021/68430

Soó R (1931) Adatok a Balatonvidék vegetációjának ismeretéhez III [Contributions to the knowledge of the vegetation of the Balaton area III]. A Magyar Biologiai Kutató Intézet Munkái 4: 293–319.

Soó R (1940) Vergangenheit und Gegenwart der pannonischen Flora und Vegetation. Nova Acta Leopoldina 56: 3–49.

Soó R (1947) Revue systématique des associations végétales des environs de Kolozsvár (respectivement de la Mezöség et de la région de la Szamos, en Transylvanie). Acta Geobotanica Hungarica 6: 3–50.

Soó R (1964) Magyarország növénytársulásainak részletes (kritikai) rendszere [Critical overview of the plant communities of Hungary]. In: Soó R (Ed.) A Magyar flóra és vegetáció rendszertani-növényföldrajzi kézikönyve I. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, HU, 130–289.

Terzi M, Di Pietro R, Theurillat J-P (2016) Nomenclature of the class *Festuco-Brometea* in Italy and remarks on the interpretation of articles 1 and 2b ICPN. Botany Letters 163: 307–319. https://doi.org/10.1080/23818107.2016.1201692

Terzi M, Di Pietro R, Theurillat J-P (2017) Proposal (21): to conserve the name *Festucetalia valesiacae* Br.-Bl. & Tx. ex Br.-Bl. 1950 against *Festucetalia* Soó 1940. Phytocoenologia 47: 305–307. https://doi.org/10.1127/phyto/2017/0186

Theurillat J-P, Terzi M, Di Pietro R (2017) Proposal (22): to conserve the name *Mesobromion erecti* (Br.-Bl. & Moor 1938) Oberd. 1957 against the name *Bromion erecti* W. Koch 1926. Phytocoenologia 47: 385–387. https://doi.org/10.1127/phyto/2017/0187

Theurillat J-P, Willner W, Fernández-González F, Bültmann H, Čarni A, Gigante D, Mucina L, Weber H (2021) International Code of Phytosociological Nomenclature. 4th edn. Applied Vegetation Science 24: e12491. https://doi.org/10.1111/avsc.12491

Toman M (1975) Materiál k fytocenologii společenstev třídy *Festuco-Brometea* na Pavlovských kopcích (jižní Morava) [Materials on phytosociology of the communities of the *Festuco-Brometea* class in the Pavlov Hills (southern Moravia)]. Zborník Pedagickej fakulty v Prešove Univerzity P. J. Šafárika v Košiciach, Prírodné vedy 1: 127–134.

Tüxen R (1952) Hecken und Gebüsche. Mitteilungen der Geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg 10: 85–117.

Weber HE, Moravec J, Theurillat J-P (2000) International Code of Phytosociological Nomenclature. 3rd edn. Journal of Vegetation Science 11: 739–768. https://doi.org/10.2307/3236580

Willner W (2015) Proposal (20): to conserve the name *Aceretalia pseudoplatani* Moor 1976 against *Tilietalia* Moor 1973. Phytocoenologia 45: 185–186. https://doi.org/10.1127/phyto/2015/0051

Willner W, Grabherr G (2007) Die Wälder und Gebüsche Österreichs. Ein Bestimmungswerk mit Tabellen. Spektrum Akademischer Verlag, Heidelberg, DE.

Willner W, Grabherr G, Pallas J, Weber HE (2011) Report of the Committee for Nomina Conservanda, Ambigua, Inversa and Mutata: 1. Phytocoenologia 41: 59–70. https://doi.org/10.1127/0340-269X/2011/0041-0488

Willner W, Theurillat J-P, Čarni A, Pallas J, Weber HE (2015) Guidelines for proposals to conserve or reject names of syntaxa. Phytocoenologia 45: 183–184. https://doi.org/10.1127/phyto/2015/0055

Willner W, Roleček J, Korolyuk A, Dengler J, Chytrý M, Janišová M, Lengyel A, Aćić S, Becker T, … Yamalov S (2019) Formalized classification of semi-dry grasslands in central and eastern Europe. Preslia 91: 25–49. https://doi.org/10.23855/preslia.2019.025

Wirth J (1993) *Rhamno-Prunetea*. In: Mucina L, Grabherr G, Wallnöfer S (Eds) Die Pflanzengesellschaften Österreichs, Teil III: Wälder und Gebüsche. Gustav Fischer, Jena, DE, 60–84.

E-mail and ORCID

Wolfgang Willner (Corresponding author, wolfgang.willner@univie.ac.at), ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1591-8386
Andraž Čarni (carni@zrc-sazu.si), ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8909-4298
Federico Fernández-González (Federico.Fdez@uclm.es), ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1234-4065
Jens Pallas (jens.pallas@gmx.de)
Jean-Paul Theurillat (Jean-Paul.Theurillat@unige.ch), ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1843-5809